

**Single-family Design Guidelines Update/
Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance Update**

**ISSUE PAPER J
Reclassification of Triggers for Application Routing**

Part II: Routing Options Further Refined

June 3, 2005

The purpose of this issue paper is to:

1. Further refine options for **alternative routing and triggers** to address high ABR caseload and additional review needs for some projects.
2. Present **Administrative Review options**.
3. Further define **Green Building Incentive and Trigger** options.
4. Provide an update regarding **Hillside Design District Boundaries**.

The paper is organized into five major sections as follows:

- A. Introduction (how Issue Paper J: Part II relates to Issue Paper J: Part I)
- B. Proposals
 - Alterations & Site Work
 - Additions
 - New Accessory Structures
 - New Homes
 - Projects > 85% of Maximum FAR
- C. Administrative Review Process
- D. Built Green Incentives and Triggers
 - Incentive (“small”, “not too tall” projects eligible for Staff Administrative Design Review)
 - Trigger (over 4000 square foot homes to require BuiltGreen)
- E. Hillside Design District Boundary Changes

Attachments

1. Routing Charts
 - Alterations & Site Work
 - Additions
 - New Homes
 - New Accessory Structure
2. Preliminary Draft Administrative Review Standards
3. >85% FAR Project Requirements
4. 2003 Summary Case Data Table &
2003 Sample Case FAR & Hearings Data
5. Summary of Green Building Programs in Other Jurisdictions &
Listing of Green Checklist Items Which Might Have Aesthetic Effects
6. Hillside Design District Addition of 500 Parcels Caseload Impact Estimate

A. Introduction

Issue Paper J Part I: Reclassification of Triggers for Application Routing & Piece-Meal Development provided background regarding existing ABR caseload, issues and an initial summary of options for draft re-routing proposals. This publication, Part II, provides some additional detail regarding the draft re-routing proposals and new routing options for alteration, sitework, new home and single-family addition projects are presented. Administrative Review procedures and issues are discussed. Last, potential new Hillside Design District boundary changes are presented.

B. Proposals

- Alterations & Site Work
- Additions
- New Accessory Structures
- New Homes
- Projects > 85% of Max. FAR.

Issue Paper J, Part I, p. 11, listed a number of assumptions regarding re-routing proposals, repeated here.

- Small and medium sized second stories are not usually as impactful to neighborhoods as large second-story additions.
- Typical master bedroom or two-bedroom second-story additions would usually qualify as “small” and “medium” sized projects.
- A “Small” second-story addition would be up to 500 square feet – to accommodate a typical second-story master bedroom project.
- A “Medium” second-story addition would be 500 to 750 square feet – to accommodate a typical second-story two-bedroom project.
- If possible, projects added to the Architectural Board of Review should be balanced with projects subtracted from the Architectural Board of Review’s current purview.
- For any projects routed to the Administrative Staff Review level, Staff would have the ability to refer any projects which do not comply with the Single-family Design Guidelines up to the Consent calendar or Full Board. Also, standards for approval at the Administrative Staff level of review would be very clear. Some categories of Administrative Staff reviewed projects would need on-site posting in cases where neighbors might be affected by the proposed development.
- One-story hillside projects < 500 square feet which are not highly visible from public viewing locations could have a lesser design review than the current Full Board review routing.
- New FAR requirements will discourage some of the larger types of two-story additions which have been applied for in the past.

Issue Paper J: Part II

Reclassification of Triggers for Application Routing

- Incentives for the Green Building concept use should be included as options in the new routing system.
- Current practice whereby projects which require a City Council approval or Coastal Development Permit are subject to Design Review should be maintained.
- The Modification Hearing Officer should have the ability to require conditions that projects obtain Design Review comments or full Design Review.

As a result of the above assumptions, Staff created the tables in Attachment 1 to illustrate potential routing for alteration, sitework, new home and single-family addition projects. The tables in Attachment 1 summarize the routing options. Also, an addendum may be issued next week summarizing how the routing options are different from current routing practices in an 11x17 sheet format. This addendum would show how Attachment 1 in Issue Paper J: Part I would change under the proposals in this paper.

Alterations and Sitework Only Projects. The shift for these projects is to bring most alterations and sitework in Hillside Design District areas to an Administrative Staff Review level. Staff is confident that an Administrative Staff Review of these cases will be effective in ensuring quality Hillside projects compatible with the neighborhood and appropriate to the site. Staff has drafted an initial framework of review criteria for these Hillside area alteration projects, Attachment 2. For projects which do not meet Administrative Review criteria, the projects would be referred up to the ABR Consent calendar. The objective of this change is to free up more ABR agenda time for two-story projects.

The Steering Committee might recommend that some project alteration proposals with controversial items, such as architectural style issues or glass railings, may be better reviewed by the Full ABR. Where project proposals are likely to be denied, the denial may be more appropriate at the Full Board level so the applicant receives feedback from more than one ABR member.

New Accessory Buildings. New accessory buildings in the Hillside Design District would be reviewed in a pattern similar to the existing routing pattern, whereby two-story hillside projects would go to the Full Board and one-story accessory buildings could be placed on the Consent calendar. For Infill areas, more two-story accessory buildings would be reviewed by the full ABR than under current practice. This accessory building chart is meant to apply only to accessory buildings not considered a residence.

Additions. Perhaps the most significant of all the routing changes is proposed for additions in the Infill areas. Two-story Infill projects which are “not too tall”, “small”, and “green” are proposed for Administrative review. “Not too tall” is defined as under 25’, a current miscellaneous design review exemption criteria. “Green” is defined as qualifying for two stars as part of the “Santa Barbara BuiltGreen Program” described in Attachment 4 of Part I of this issue paper and at www.builtgreensb.org/checklist.pdf. “Small” is defined as:

- < 50% of the 1992 home square footage &
- < 500 square feet of total additional construction square footage &
- < 750 square feet of total additional square footage of construction &
- < 85% of maximum square footage allowance for the project’s lot size

Issue Paper J: Part II

Reclassification of Triggers for Application Routing

Since Staff currently does not usually review additions, this Administrative Routing of additions to Staff would be a new practice. Some of these small additions might have a significant percentage of the square footage consumed by any garage or carport additions proposed with the second story addition.

All the larger two-story Infill projects would be referred up to the full ABR for review. Some one-story Hillside Design District projects are proposed to be eligible for Staff Administrative Review if the projects are “not too tall”, “small”, and “green” as with Infill projects eligible for Administrative Review. However, the Hillside projects would also need the following characteristics to be eligible for Administrative Staff Review:

- “not highly visible from public viewing locations”, and
- propose <100 cubic yards of grading on slopes less than 20% and
- comply with retaining wall guidelines

New Main Residence Structures. This draft re-routing proposal continues a tradition of maintaining a higher level of ABR review for new main residence structures, higher than the level of review for additions or alterations. As before, all new Hillside Design District single-family structures would be reviewed by the ABR. Different than current practice, all two-story new Infill homes would be reviewed by the ABR, not just those homes which trigger size criteria and are not exempt per miscellaneous design criteria. Another new proposal is that single-story homes over 4,000 square feet would be reviewed by the ABR and would require a two-star rating in the BuiltGreen program, regardless of location. Previously, single-story homes of any size in the Infill areas would not be subject to Design Review.

Projects > 85% of Max. FAR. The Steering Committee has discussed a number of times how projects over a certain “threshold” (a term used in earlier issue papers), and now over 85% of the maximum FAR might be reviewed differently. The logic is that a higher level of scrutiny is needed to ensure these higher FAR projects are compatible with neighbors and appropriate for a site. Correspondingly, more information and noticing is appropriate for these projects. Also, some project characteristics, such as grading on steep slopes, are not suitable for a project to exhibit a higher Floor to Lot Area Ratio. The Steering Committee last reviewed this topic on May 20th. The results of this discussion, and the different application requirements for projects over 85% FAR, are listed in Attachment 3.

ABR Hearing “Savings” Because of New FARs? Assuming that all cases which would have exceeded currently proposed FAR maximums would take no more than four ABR hearings, a theoretical savings of 13 hearings was identified in the sample set. Extrapolated to the total number of projects in 2003, this could be a potential savings of 33 hearings per year. If this theory is true, approximately eight new two-story case projects might be heard using hearing time saved from theoretical efficiency achieved through FAR implementation. Eight additional case capacity for ABR through this type of “FAR efficiency savings” unfortunately appears minimal in comparison to the additional second story or two-story projects proposed for review, preliminary estimates are that there may be upwards of 30 cases for Full Board Review (Attachment 4).

C. Administrative/Staff Design Review

As described in Issue Paper J: Part I pages 8-9 and 12, Administrative Staff Review is currently performed for certain Hillside Design District small projects. Key to Administrative Staff review are standards. In an Administrative Staff Review, Staff checks to ensure that a project is consistent with the administrative standards. If the standards are met, Staff gives the project a Design Review approval. If the standards are not met, Staff shares this information with the applicant. The applicant then has the following two choices:

1. To respond to Staff comments by changing the project proposal to achieve consistency with standards; or
2. Place the project on a Consent or Full ABR agenda.

Administrative Review is more efficient and expedient than Consent or Full ABR review because time is not lost on waiting for a place on the next available agenda and then for the set meeting to take place. An Administrative Staff review is usually completed within a few days, in accordance with Staff availability.

There are potentially a large number of projects which could be routed through Administrative review. Effective administrative review standards are key to Administrative project review. Effective standards are standards which are clear and easily understood by the public and Staff. Also, effective standards, when followed, would prevent poorly designed projects. To determine the appropriateness of routing cases for Administrative Review, assurance of the possibility of an effective administrative standards framework is essential. Given this, Staff has prepared an initial draft outline of possible standards for use for many of the Hillside Design District alteration and sitework projects. (Attachment 2) Again, it is important to emphasize that projects which do not meet standards would be referred from Staff Administrative Review to the ABR Consent or Full Board Calendar. In this way, the Administrative Review serves as a “filter”. Many proposals will already be acceptable when Staff first reviews them, some other projects will be incrementally improved through Staff comment prior to approval, and a few other projects will pose issues which will be referred to the ABR for further consideration. In this way, the Consent calendar is relieved of many acceptable, but time consuming, projects while a standard of quality is assured.

Expanding Staff Administrative review to include some two-story addition projects poses some additional issues described below, including staff workload impact, and the need for noticing and appeal and environmental review for some projects.

Staff Workload Impact. Staff is continuing to refine case statistic report information (Attachment 4). The following estimates list “worst case scenario” or the upper limit of possible projected case impact. Staff hopes that refined statistics are likely to lower these number to some degree. Updated statistics will be made available as an addendum to this issue paper. Preliminary figures indicate up to 200 additional cases could be eligible for design review per year if all two story projects receive design review. Of those, Staff estimates that approximately 66% of the Infill addition projects could be small enough to be proposed to be eligible for Administrative Review based on project statistics from 2003. It appears approximately 66% of

Issue Paper J: Part II

Reclassification of Triggers for Application Routing

the 2003 Infill single-family addition projects (108 projects) were under 500 square feet and might have featured a maximum height under 25'. A table reflecting Staff's research on this topic is expected to be published in an addendum next week. Up to an additional two cases per week for Staff to Administratively review "addition" projects alone may be a significant workload impact, especially when coupled with the Hillside Design District alteration and sitework projects proposed for Staff Administrative Review. It appears the Design Review Supervisor or a Project Planner or Associate Planner position within the existing budget might be able to handle these additional reviews, but more feasibility analysis will be needed.

However, Staff has not yet researched the potential Staff and ABR workload impact of reviewing all projects, including single-story additions, sitework, alterations, within the Hillside Design District rather than just those projects on parcels with a slope of 20% or greater. There is likely to be a significant number of additional cases which would need to be reviewed by Staff and the ABR if all Hillside Design District project, regardless of slope are subject to design review. Further research on the impact of reviewing all HDD projects regardless of slope is expected to be presented at the June 10th Steering Committee meeting.

While the review of alterations or sitework proposals may involve the verification of objective standards, the review of additions may involve more subjective judgment to determine whether or not a project is in compliance with standards. For an administrative review of an addition, a checklist for Staff use listing many or most of the single-family design guidelines would likely be created. The checklist would include many specific guidelines regarding neighborhood compatibility, appropriate site development in response to constraints, good neighbor guidelines, grading, and landscaping. Since guidelines are not, in fact, required standards, the actual standard which Staff would be checking for is "general compliance with the Single-family Design Guidelines". Therefore, Staff could note some items as inconsistent with the guidelines, but conclude that the overall project is generally consistent with the guidelines. Where a project is inconsistent with the single-family design guidelines in too many significant aspects, comment would be made to the applicant. The comment would likely be in the form of the checklist filled out for the project with additional comments as to how the project proposal might change to improve guideline compliance. The exercise of subjective judgment is necessary to determine if a project complies with such items as "neighborhood compatibility", "appropriate response to site constraints" and "good neighbor privacy and view impacts", as well as in determining at what point a project is "generally in compliance" with the Single-family Design Guidelines.

Environmental Review. Project permit decisions that involve the exercise of subjective judgment on the part of the decision-maker are called "discretionary". Discretionary decisions require environmental review under provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) before action is taken to approve or deny the permit. However, CEQA identifies many categories of minor projects that are exempt from preparation of an environmental review document, such as alterations and small additions, as long as there is no potential for a significant environmental impact that would override the exemption. The projects proposed for Administrative review in this issue paper all fall in with the CEQA exemption categories, and the proposed general standards for Administrative Review stipulate that the project must not have the potential to have a significant environmental impact. For example, small projects which involve grading generally fall into a CEQA exemption category; however, Staff analysis of a

Issue Paper J: Part II

Reclassification of Triggers for Application Routing

particular project may find information indicating a potential environmental impact that would override the CEQA exemption and require preparation of a CEQA document, either a Negative Declaration (ND) or an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). In this case, the project would be referred to the Consent or Full ABR Board since it would not meet the General Administrative Review criteria of “no potential for a significant environmental impact”.

Currently project permit decisions at Design Review Consent calendar level or above are considered discretionary decisions and are therefore subject to environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Environmental review by staff starts with a preliminary review for exemption from further CEQA documentation (per CEQA Guidelines 15060-15062), which includes completion of a Master Environmental Assessment (MEA) check. Most such projects do not involve significant environmental impacts and are determined to be exempt from further environmental review per the provisions of the CEQA Guidelines. If the project has the potential to cause significant environmental effects, an Initial Study is prepared, followed by a Negative Declaration where it can be shown that project impacts would be less than significant, or an Environmental Impact Report for projects with significant environmental impacts. These environmental documents require further public review and approval¹.

Noticing. Noticing does not occur currently for Administrative Review. This is part of why Administrative Review is faster than Consent calendar or Full Board Design Review processes. However, projects that have the potential to substantially impact neighbors, such as two-story project additions, require noticing and a meaningful opportunity to comment. Therefore, Staff proposes that single-family additions eligible for Administrative Review have a “Notice of Approval” mailed to the 20 closest homes or to properties within a 100’ radius, whichever is greater. The notice would include a project description and a 10-day deadline for appeal of the project by writing to be directed to Staff.

Appeal. A 10-day appeal period, as described above, under “Noticing”, is consistent with ABR Consent and Full Board approval processes. Different from Consent and Full Board procedures, this proposal features notice occurring upon project approval, rather than upon a project being agendaized for a meeting. This approach makes sense for Staff Administrative review because there is no formal hearing, and the notice upon approval allows a significant opportunity for the public to comment or appeal the project. As with projects appealed at ABR currently, in response to an appeal filed, an applicant would have three choices:

1. Proceed with the project to an appeal hearing.
2. Withdraw the project.
3. Voluntarily choose to revise the project to respond to concerns raised by an appellant to the satisfaction of the appellant so that the appellant drops the appeal.

Different from Consent and Full Board appeal processes, in this proposal for Administrative Review, appealed projects would be heard by the ABR at the Consent or Full Board level, but would not be appealable to City Council. In other words, after an Administrative decision is appealed, the ABR is the last appeal body; no further appeal mechanisms would be available.

¹For more information regarding the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Initial Study and Environmental Impact Report requirements, see <http://ceres.ca.gov/Ceqa>.

Issue Paper J: Part II

Reclassification of Triggers for Application Routing

Staff would assign the appeal hearings for appealed Administrative items to the appropriate hearing body, Consent or Full ABR, depending on the complexity of issues raised by a project.

Advantages of Administrative Review for Applicants? If noticing is required for some projects proposed for Administrative Review, would the current Consent calendar process be almost as efficient for those projects? With Administrative Review, applicants would still save time in waiting for agenda scheduling of their project. The difference in time savings would be almost three weeks for a small single-family addition reviewed by Staff at Concept, Preliminary and Final stages rather than at ABR. Also, applicants would be protected from appeals to City Council. Projects reviewed Administratively are proposed to only be appealable to the Architectural Board of Review. And last, with Administrative Review applicants save costs associated with professionals attending an ABR hearing for project reviews.

Two Consent calendars? If these advantages are not considered significant enough, perhaps making the potential additional 108 two-story Infill projects eligible for Consent calendar might be considered. To accommodate 108 additional projects, perhaps the Consent calendar would occur twice a week and might be divided into separate residential and commercial Consent calendars.

D. Green Building Incentives and Trigger

Issue Paper J: Part I, pages 3 and 12-13, contained initial discussions of the Built Green program. This document, Part II, proposes incorporating a green building component in project routing for single-family home additions in two ways, through “incentives” and a “trigger”. Before the incentive and trigger ideas can be described, it is important to explain a “green building” standard which may be used. There are two potential “green standard” options as follows:

Option #1 Green Standard: The Built Green Santa Barbara Program

The Built Green program, introduced in more detail in Issue Paper J: Part I, was designed by the Santa Barbara Contractor’s Association working with representatives from local jurisdictions as a self-certification volunteer program and has many flexible guidelines. The program was commenced in November 2004 with publication of the “Remodeler Handbook”. So far 40 contractors and some architects have signed up for the program and are working on green projects, but none of the projects have been completed yet and so no green stars have been awarded for projects just yet. Once a proposed green star program is completed, the contractor turns in a checklist which lists the items the project includes to achieve points totaling a one, two or three star Built Green level to the Built Green program. The Built Green program does not verify that projects include components listed on the checklist, rather the program simply double-checks point calculations and based on the applicant’s signature declaration of accuracy, awards green stars. The City of Santa Barbara plans to soon begin recognizing projects applying for the Built Green program by utilizing different colored routing stamps at the Building counter. However, the City will not verify that all indicated Green items are followed; it is solely the applicant’s responsibility to comply. According to the Built Green Santa Barbara website, successful programs of this nature are hosted in the cities of Denver, Colorado, Atlanta, Georgia; Portland, Oregon; Scottsdale, Arizona; Austin, Texas; and the states of Wisconsin, Florida, Hawaii, Vermont and Washington. Information regarding some of these jurisdictions’ programs, completed by Public Works Department Staff, is included in Attachment 5.

There are a few characteristics of this voluntary Built Green program that do not make it readily adaptable for City-applied incentives or requirements.

- **Some Items Redundant with State Law.** The program is designed to have many items which are fairly easy to achieve included in the one and two star BuiltGreen levels. For example, some items are included in the checklist which are already required by State law (ex. Title 24² items regarding energy efficiency).
- **Many Guidelines vs. Standards.** The program, since it is self-certified, has many point-earning items which are guidelines open to interpretation rather than quantitative standards. For example, in Item 5-37, three points are awarded if re-milled salvaged lumber is used, but the quantity or percentage of lumber which must be used is not specified. Could one piece of

² For more information on Title 24, see: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/title24/index.html>.

Issue Paper J: Part II

Reclassification of Triggers for Application Routing

re-milled lumber used qualify for the points? A standard for a certain percentage of re-milled lumber use would transform this guideline to a more useful standard (for example, see Item 5-44 specifying 50% sustainably harvested wood).

- **No Compliance Check.** The City normally verifies that projects meet zoning code standards and, if a discretionary project, City policies and guidelines where applicable. Plan check and building inspections ensure a project meets conditions of approval. If a “green” incentive or requirement were to be implemented, it seems that the City should include a mechanism to verify that project components are implemented and that they appropriately meet green standards. However, under the Green Built program, projects could have approximately 10 to 70 checklist items to verify. Verifying “green” building plan components in the field through building inspections could represent a significant staff workload increase. Also, if the City were to take on the role of verifying correct point assignment on an applicant’s Green Built checklist, this would represent another significant staff workload increase.
- **Need for Consistent Lasting Environmental Benefit.** Some items do not require items integral to the home construction. Examples include Items 4-6 “Doormat & Shoe Rack”, 2-49 “Educate future owners about green cleaning products” and 2-50 – “...provide worm bins”. Each of these checklist items can grant points for components non-integral to the building and dependent on future homeowner’s carrying through the green concepts. For example, results are dependent on the homeowner finding a place for using the shoe rack and replacing as necessary, maintaining a worm bin and using green building products which they receive information about. If the City were to grant incentives or require a certain green star level of certification, it seems that the City would want to work with Built Green to make sure checklist items would be more likely to have lasting results. For example, rather than providing a shoe rack, providing a “built in” shoe rack and space for seating near entrances might be more appropriate for a higher probability of lasting results. Or, rather than only educating about green cleaning products, also setting construction standards to ensure low maintenance cleaning surfaces might be more effective. For example, a specification for minimized tile grout, or, no white or black tiles or grout, could cut down on the need for harsh chemicals for maintenance with a higher potential for a long-lasting positive effect.

Due to these issues of redundancy with State law, numerous interpretations of guidelines, lack of compliance checking and items which are not focused on achieving a probable lasting environmental benefit, City Staff would need to work with the Built Green staff to revise the checklist. In other words, if the City of Santa Barbara goes the route of utilizing an incentive and/or trigger Built Green program, the Built Green checklist will need to be revised. Built Green Director Karin Perissinotto has indicated the Built Green program is open to working on changes to the checklist with the City. Revising the checklist and Remodeler Handbook with Built Green to address above issues would be a significant Staff work effort. If City Council chooses to create incentives or regulatory mechanisms for single-family homes per the Built Green Santa Barbara program, this may need to be implemented in a later phase to allow time for finalizing work with the Built Green Staff. The BuiltGreen program intends to republish the Remodeler Handbook with updates approximately once a year. Perhaps through two rounds of edits, one in 2005 and the second in 2006, the Handbook could be implemented by the City.

Issue Paper J: Part II

Reclassification of Triggers for Application Routing

Cost. Another item for consideration is the cost of participating in the program. Participation in the current Built Green program currently costs \$250 per year plus \$10 to \$50 per project. This participation fee provides the participant with a large resource binder guiding applicants on how to implement the Built Green checklist, program orientation and helps to maintain availability of other Built Green web and office resources available to members. If the City were to require a star rating through Built Green, it could add up to \$300 to the project cost just to participate in the program, not including any higher materials or labor costs associated with implementing Built Green checklist items. Is this a reasonable cost? The commercial project oriented “LEED” program (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) can cost \$15,000 to \$30,000 for certification alone.³ In comparison to the LEED program, the voluntary Built Green program appears very reasonably priced, but the additional cost must also be considered in the context of existing applicant fees.

Two Stars. If the Built Green system is chosen to establish a project as “green”, Staff would suggest utilizing the “two-star” rating, rather than a “one-star” or “three-star” rating for projects for a few reasons. First, the one-star rating, although it provides community benefit, is perceived by many to be too “easy to achieve” and therefore not worthy of granting an incentive. The three-star rating is perceived as being especially challenging to achieve. It is the intent to make the incentive routing described below available to a significant portion of the small and “not too tall” projects to Staff Administrative Review. If the bar is set too high regarding the green incentive, then too many projects would need to be reviewed by the Full ABR or Consent calendar if all two-story projects are to receive Design Review. Regarding a potential proposal for a trigger for two BuiltGreen stars for projects over 4,000 square feet, described below, again, one star would not appear to achieve enough community benefit, but three stars may translate to additional project costs at a level perceived as onerous. The two-star Built Green rating seems reasonable as both an incentive for smaller projects and as a potential large home requirement.

Option #1: Built Green Program Green Standard Advantages and Disadvantages

Advantages:

- Makes use of a system that has already had a lot of community work and multi-jurisdiction input.
- Makes use of a system that has support from the Contractor’s Association and many architects.
- Makes use of a system that is similar to those that have been successful in other communities.
- Provides comprehensive education through the Remodeler Handbook on a broad range of green building topics to make implementation easier.
- Resources available through the BuiltGreen program may lessen some workload impact to Staff of orienting the public on how to use the program.

² For more information about the LEED program, see: <http://www.usgbc.org/DisplayPage.aspx?CategoryID=19>.

Issue Paper J: Part II

Reclassification of Triggers for Application Routing

Disadvantages

- Will need more time to implement than Option #2 due to rewriting time-frames with BuiltGreen program.
- May be more costly to applicants (\$300 for an initial project) than Option #2.
- May lead to a need to assign points for checklist items, verify compliance, and assign stars. This could constitute a need to increase staffing to accommodate the program.

Option #2: Simplified City-Crafted Green Standard

Rather than edit the Built Green Santa Barbara program to fit a regulatory or incentive function, perhaps the City should create a narrowed list of crucial green items which together constitute a “green” status for the City of Santa Barbara. The Built Green program would remain a separate volunteer program which City Council could give recognition to three star participants. Examples of items that the City is most interested in seeing addressed could be as follows.

1. **Site permeability.** Effective **site permeability**, no additional off-site runoff would result from the project.
2. **Future or proposed solar panel installation location** indicated on plans to accommodate a level of solar panel performance commensurate with an ability to qualify for State tax credits.
3. **Grading < 250 cubic yards** total, including under any new proposed main building footprint area.
4. **Setback from Creek.** Proposed development **at least 35’ from a creek**, where feasible site locations >35’ from a creek exist on a property for a proposed project.
5. **Native landscaping.** Where landscape plans are proposed, at least 25% of the area to be landscaped is either native and/or edible plant species.
6. **Lumber sustainably produced.** Use at least 50% of dimensional lumber certified as “sustainably produced”.
7. **Recycled/reused content.** Specify either recycled, reused, or certified “sustainably harvested” wood materials for at least 10% of square footage of finished areas (flooring, tile, fixture, cabinetry, roof, door & window square footage combined)
8. **Pools to be Heated w/ Solar.** If a pool is proposed, it must be heated with at least half solar equipment.
9. **Energy efficiency & health & indoor air quality standards.** Staff would create a narrowed list of items related to energy efficiency and health and indoor air quality. The items would be clear standards not redundant with State law. Once the standards in this category are compiled, it would need to be determined how many of them would need to be complied with out of the total number of standards on the list. The standards might be drawn from the County’s Innovative Building Review Program (IBRP)⁴ energy efficiency standards, other jurisdictions’ “green” standards, or from the Built Green Santa Barbara checklist items from the following categories:
 - Energy Efficiency: envelope, heating/cooling, water heating, lighting and alternative systems
 - Health and Indoor Air Quality: Layout and Material Selection, Moisture Control, Air Distribution and Filtration, and HVAC Equipment

⁴ For more information regarding the IBRP, see: <http://www.countyofsb.org/plandev/bldg-safety/ibrp/default.html>

Issue Paper J: Part II

Reclassification of Triggers for Application Routing

Option #2: Simplified City-Crafted Green Standard Advantages and Disadvantages

Advantages:

- Would significantly lower the number of items to be verified.
- Cost associated with becoming a BuiltGreen program participant (up to \$300 fee) is not required.
- Makes use of the standards for Materials Efficiency and Energy Efficiency checklist items in the Built Green program.
- Entire checklist would not need to be reviewed and edited with BuiltGreen Staff, leading to early implementation ability.
- Checking for compliance would be much easier with this abbreviated list of items.
- Compatible with continuation of a volunteer BuiltGreen recognition program.

Disadvantages

- The broader array of potential green items in Option #1 are not specifically addressed or encouraged.
- The system which already is supported by the Contractor's Association and many architects is not directly used, rather it is modified and support for the modified version would need to be gained.

Potential Green Proposals

The three proposals below would utilize one of the Green standards outlined in Options 1 and 2, above.

A. Routing Incentive for Small Additions. The above project routing proposal contains a Green Building incentive for “not too tall” and “small” single-family additions. If a project is under 25', and “small”, as described above, and qualifies as “green”, the project is proposed to become eligible for Staff Administrative review. Administrative review is less costly and may be more timely than either a Consent or Full Board review. Consistent with the City's current effort to develop an incentives program for Green Building, this is a “routing incentive” for these small projects. Projects which are small and not too tall, but *not* green, would not be eligible for Administrative Review and instead would be routed to the lengthier review process.

Aesthetic Concern. One issue posed by the Steering Committee in its initial discussion of potential Design Review incentive routing is the potential for some green building components to detract from a structure's appearance. Staff reviewed the Built Green checklist and found 19 of the approximately 250 total checklist items could alter the exterior appearance of the project structure or landscaping, listed in Attachment 5. The analysis found the following:

Issue Paper J: Part II

Reclassification of Triggers for Application Routing

Potential Aesthetic Effect?	Items
neutral effect likely	4
+ effect likely	6
- effect possible depending on design	7
+, -, or neutral depending on design	2

After analysis, Staff proposes that two of the BuiltGreen items: accessory dwelling units and vegetative roof systems, if proposed, would make the project ineligible for a Design Review routing incentive to Administrative Review. Rather, green projects with these components would be reviewed by the Consent or Full ABR and instead be eligible for other City incentives, such as Building routing incentives. Projects with other items with the potential to lead to negative visual effects, such as window placement, skylights, cistern equipment, or solar tubes, would only be eligible for Administrative review routing incentives if they comply with Single-family Design Guidelines and Administrative Review criteria. Solar panels cannot be addressed by the City in a Consent, Full or Administrative capacity due to a recently passed State law, and so routing to an Administrative level would be just as appropriate as routing to Consent or Full ABR for this project component.

Under the City Green Routing incentive, the siting for a future solar panel would be required to be shown. In this case, there may be a potential for solar panels proposed later on the same site to have less of a visual effect. The nine potential items on a modified City green checklist would likely have a neutral or positive impact, except for solar water heating (See Attachment 5). It will be unknown what materials and energy efficiency items might be included in item 9 until a checklist would be further drafted in detail. In general, however, it appears that most projects meeting a City crafted green checklist would be eligible for an Administrative routing incentive, if other routing criteria of “small” and “not too tall” are met.

In conclusion, with either a Green Built or City crafted green standard, a “green” design review routing incentive would not lead to encouraging projects with poor aesthetics. See Attachment 5 for a table of the items with potential visual effects and how they would be routed.

B. Trigger Idea at 4,000 Square Feet. Another item for consideration is a unique “Green Building Requirement” for home proposals which would result in over 4,000 square feet. Implementing this draft idea would be very innovative, as the City currently does not require “Green Building” for commercial or multi-family projects. Given that the single-family routing and triggers are being overhauled at this time, however, Staff is presenting this as an interesting option for further potential exploration. Homes over 4,000 square feet pose sizeable resource consumption and construction impacts. A two-star BuiltGreen requirement for homes over 4,000 square feet would help to lessen the environmental and community impact of larger single-family developments. Under this option, for applicants who would prefer not to participate in the BuiltGreen program, a very flexible home program can still be achieved under 4,000 square feet. The environmental impact of the home under 4,000 square feet could likely be less than the 4,000 sq. ft. plus home built green. This trigger would apply to all single family related square footage on a site. However, if there are two units on a site, the individual unit

Issue Paper J: Part II

Reclassification of Triggers for Application Routing

with a project proposal would need to exceed 4,000 sq. ft. for the two-star BuiltGreen requirement to be triggered. In other words, the total of the two units would not be the figure used to determine the trigger, only the total of the project unit and its associated structures would be considered.

C. Educational Checklist Submittal Requirement. Many homeowners are not aware of green building concepts, their importance, or how easy they may be to incorporate. There is likely to be value in having applicants fill out a checklist based on the green standard in either Option 1 or 2 above. No requirement for compliance with the standard would be in place, it would simply be an educational item for the applicants, and perhaps encourage them to incorporate green components once they become familiar with what they constitute. If Option 2 were implemented, then reference to the BuiltGreen website for more information might also be included on the list of considerations so that applicants could find more information if interested. Projects turning in a checklist could then have their proposed green standard listed on ABR project agendas if applicable for informational purposes and as another form of applicant recognition. Projects which would be required to turn in a green consideration checklist would be:

- New home projects
- Home addition projects > 50% of the existing structure
- Remodels of more than 70% of the existing floor area

D. Recognition Program. An overall green building incentive program is currently being developed by a multi-Divisional team of City Staff for all types of projects, including commercial and multi-family projects. The incentive program is likely to include a recognition program. The recognition program would likely recognize those projects built at a three star level through the BuiltGreen Santa Barbara program. Either Option 1 or 2, above, would complement such a recognition program.

E. Hillside Design District Boundary Changes

The need to change the Hillside Design District Boundary to become more accurate was discussed in Issue Paper I on pages 5 – 7. The Steering Committee agreed it was important to reset the Hillside Design District Boundaries to reflect new, more accurate information about the location of 20% slopes and follow logical boundary patterns. The Steering Committee reviewed a couple of draft boundary adjustments during one of the Hillside Issues discussions and provided feedback. Staff has begun work on adjusting all of the remaining Hillside Design District boundaries and plans to present these draft changes at the June 10th Steering Committee meeting. The draft boundary changes will be published in the Draft Updated Single-family Design Guidelines. A Staff estimate, regarding the potential caseload impact of adding up to 500 additional parcels to the Hillside Design District is detailed in Attachment 6. Staff estimates approximately 20 additional Design Review cases per year would result from adding 500 additional properties to the Hillside Design District. Again, please note this figure is based on only properties over 20% slope being considered, Staff is further researching the additional impacts of considering all projects regardless of slope.

Alterations (no new sf) & Sitework Only

	Hillside Design District	Infill
Full Board	To be determined- Potentially some projects with major or sensitive site issues	n.a.
ABR Consent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alterations as determined by Staff (Minor in nature) or Alterations to previously approved ABR projects 	Alterations to previously approved ABR projects determined by Staff to be potentially inconsistent with intent of previous approval or inconsistent with Single-family Design Guidelines.
Administrative Review	Most alterations & site work	Alterations to previously approved ABR projects. (Minor in nature)
Ministerial Building Permit Only-No Design Review	To be determined. Minor in nature	All alterations & > 50 cubic yards sitework
No Building Permit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sitework w/ < 50 cubic yards of grading Other exempt work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sitework w/ < 50 cubic yards of grading Other exempt work

New Accessory* Building

	Hillside Design District	Infill
Full Board	<p><i>2 or More Story Projects</i></p> <p>All new accessory buildings > 15' & > 120 sq.ft. & not eligible for Consent or Admin. Review</p>	<p><i>2 or More Story Projects</i></p> <p>All new accessory buildings > 120 sq.ft. & > 15' tall & not eligible for Admin. Review or creates > 4,000 total site sq. ft. (must be "Green")</p>
ABR Consent	<p><i>1 Story Projects</i></p> <p>< 17' tall & < 500 sq. ft.</p>	n.a.
Administrative Review	To be determined	To be determined
Ministerial Building Permit Only-No Design Review	n.a.	<p><i>1 Story Projects</i></p> <p>< 17' tall & < 4,000 total site sq. ft.</p>
Ministerial Building Permit Only-No Design Review	<p><i>1 Story Projects</i></p> <p>< 120 sq. ft. & < 15' tall & < 50 cubic yards grading</p>	<p><i>1 Story Projects</i></p> <p>< 120 sq. ft. & < 15' tall & < 50 cubic yards grading</p>

*Accessory Building: "A subordinate building or portion of the main building, the use of which is incidental to that of the main building on the same lot." (MC28.04.020) Examples of an accessory building include: artist studio, cabana, pool house, gazebo, greenhouse, detached garage or carport, detached living area ("detached guest room"), laundry or utility room, playhouse, storage/shed and workshop/hobby/exercise room.

Additions

	Hillside Design District	Infill
Full Board	<p><i>1 & 2 or More Story Projects</i></p> <p>> 500 sq.ft. or</p> <p>< 500 sq.ft. & does not meet Consent or Administrative Review Criteria</p>	<p><i>2 or More Story & Large 1 Story Projects</i></p> <p>> 25' tall or</p> <p>> 750 sq.ft. or</p> <p>> 17' tall & < 750 sq.ft. & does not meet Admin. Review criteria or</p> <p>< 17' tall & will result in > 4,000 sq. ft. (requires "Green")</p>
ABR Consent	<p><i>1 & 2 Story Projects</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additions which meet almost all Admin. Review Criteria or Additions referred up by Staff 	<p><i>2 Story & Large 1 Story Projects</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additions which meet almost all Admin. Review Criteria or Additions referred up by Staff
Administrative Review	<p><i>1 Story Projects</i></p> <p>< 17' tall &</p> <p>< 50% of 1992 sq.ft. &</p> <p>< 500 sq.ft. 1st flr. &</p> <p>"Green" &</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not "highly visible" from public viewing locations & Grading only on project sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < 20% slope < 200 cubic yards of grading & < complies w/ retaining wall guidelines 	<p><i>2 Story Projects: "Not too Tall", "Small" & "Green"</i></p> <p>< 25' tall &</p> <p>"Small":</p> <p>< 50% of 1992 sq. ft. &</p> <p>< 500 sq.ft. 1st flr. &</p> <p>< 750 sq.ft. incl. 2nd flr. &</p> <p>< 85% of Max. FAR &</p> <p>"Green"</p>
Ministerial Building Permit Only-No Design Review	To be determined	<p><i>1 Story Projects</i></p> <p>< 17' &</p> <p>< 4,000 sq. ft. including garage</p>

New Residence Structures

	Hillside Design District	Infill
Full Board	<p><i>1 & 2 or More Story Projects</i></p> <p>All new main residence structures</p> <p>> 4,000 total site sq. ft.* (must be "Green")</p>	<p><i>2 or More Story & Large 1 Story Projects</i></p> <p>> 17' tall or</p> <p>> 4,000 total site sq. ft.* (must be "Green")</p>
ABR Consent	n.a.	n.a.
Administrative Review-	n.a.	n.a.
Ministerial Building Permit Only-No Design Review	n.a.	<p><i>1 Story Projects</i></p> <p>< 17' & < 4,000 total site sq. ft.*</p>

*For one unit only, if there are two-units on a site, only the square footage of the project proposal unit and its associated structures is considered to determine if this review requirement is triggered.